



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,057	08/03/2001	Michael L. Asmussen	SEDN/5313	8084
56015	7590	03/28/2007	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			DAYE, CHELCIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/28/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/921,057	Applicant(s) ASMUSSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Chelcie Daye	Art Unit 2161

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

*Amendments
not filed
SPE/TCL 2102*

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues, Dudkiewicz is not a proper reference against applicant's application, because applicant's invention has an earlier filing date than Dudkiewicz. Also, applicant is requesting a copy of the Dudkiewicz provisional application if the examiner is relying upon the filing date of the provisional, and is so, applicant believes this constitutes as a new rejection. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated within the first office action dated 06/28/06 and the final office action dated 01/11/07, the examiner is relying upon the provisional filing date of the Dudkiewicz reference and examiner fully believes the provisional application of the Dudkiewicz reference discloses all of the rejected limitations for which it was relied upon, and therefore does not constitute as a new rejection. Also, examiner directs applicant's attention to <http://pair.uspto.gov>, in order to receive a copy of the provisional application.

Applicant argues, Balogh fails to teach the limitations of claim 1 and in particular, "metadata related to the available aggregated content from the plurality of media sources ... wherein the suggestion database processor searches the suggestion database, based on one or more search request criteria, to produce a list of keywords to be used to suggest content from the plurality of media sources". Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In particular, as can be seen from the office action dated 01/11/07, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103, for the combination of Balogh in view of Dudkiewicz. Specifically, some of the claim limitations (i.e. 'content being aggregated from the plurality of media sources' and 'the suggestion database processor searching the suggestion database, based on one or more search request criteria, to produce a list of keywords to be used to suggest content from the plurality of media sources') which applicant is arguing Balogh does not disclose, was not relied upon by Balogh to disclose. As such, those particular limitations were disclosed by Dudkiewicz.

Applicant argues, Balogh does not teach "searching from numerous sources of content such as video, television, radio, audio, multimedia, computer software, and electronic books, as disclosed on page 14, line 30 to page 15, line 20 of the present application". Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., 'searching from numerous sources of content such as video, television, radio, audio, multimedia, computer software, and electronic books') are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).